



POLICY COMMITTEE

February 12, 2016

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes February 12, 2016 Council Chambers #115

Attendance:

Policy Committee: Lisa Ridge; Jim Ude; Andrew Cibor; Jack Baker; Geoff McKim; Adam Wason; Richard Martin; Sarah Ryterband; Jason Banach; Andy Ruff

Staff: Josh Desmond; Anna Dragovich; Emily Avers

Others: Larry Jacobs, Chamber of Commerce; Neil Kopper, City of Bloomington; Megan Banta, Herald Times; Jason Eakin, Monroe County Government

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of the Minutes
 - a. January 8, 2016

****Martin moved for approval. McKim seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.**

- III. Communications from the Chair: None at this time

IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees

- a. Citizens Advisory Committee: Sarah Ryterband represented the CAC. The CAC met and recommended approval of the action items on the agenda today. We said goodbye to Vince Caristo. We were very fortunate that Lisa Ridge and an American Structurepoint representative came in to talk with us about the updates to the Fullerton Pike Phase I and Phase II projects. There was a great deal of dismay expressed about the size of the roundabout at the Rogers/Gordon Pike interface. We asked for metrics which American Structurepoint could not give us as to why it needs to be as large as it is.
- b. Technical Advisory Committee: Andrew Cibor represented the TAC. At our meeting we elected a new chair and vice chair, myself and Jane Fleig from City Utilities. We also discussed the MPO request for Federal Functional Classifications updates. The TAC unanimously voted for approval. Towards the end of the meeting there were some requests for staff to do refreshers on some of the policies and bylaws that are in place and that may be appropriate for tweaking in the future at a future meeting.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

- a. Josh Desmond provided a personnel update. Vince Caristo, our Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator and MPO staffer has left us to move to Montana. We certainly will miss him here. We did post his position earlier this week and we will try to get his position filled as soon as we can. Our deadline for applications is the beginning of March.
- b. FY 2017 Planning Emphasis Areas: Josh Desmond presented. This is a precursor to our work on developing a new two year Unified Planning Work Program. Those of you who've been around for a while know every two years we put together a two-year work program which we're required to do in order to document how we're planning to spend the federal planning money that is given to us for MPO operations and planning activities. We'll wrap up our Fiscal Year '15/'16 work program very soon and we will need to adopt a new work program for Fiscal Years '17 and '18

before the current one expires July 1st. We're in that process very heavily. We have a deadline of March 1st to submit a rough draft to INDOT and FHWA for review. Shortly after that we will bring a draft to you to start reviewing. As a precursor to creating each work program we're given PEAs, or Planning Emphasis Areas, by Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administration. These are a set of 3-5 key areas that we need to implement as part of our 2-year work program. We get those annually, so they'll give us another one in the middle of our work program and we'll have to adjust to accommodate that a year from now. For the next fiscal year we're supposed to take a look at 4 PEAs. I like to get these out to the committees before we do the actual work program so you're familiar with the PEAs we're working on beyond the usual operation stuff we do. Three of the PEAs are the same as we've been doing the last couple of years. There won't be radical changes for us to deal with in terms of responding to those. Title VI program management is new. If you recall, over the last several years one of the PEAs for MPOs has been having MPOs becoming advocates for the LPAs to develop and adopt their ADA transition plans that document how your government facilities and infrastructure are going to be accessible per the federal guidelines. We've done that. It's been a great success across Indiana both within the MPOs and in areas that aren't MPOs. In fact, Federal Highway is looking to the Indiana division as a model for how they were able to accomplish that. Now the next step is to look at Title VI compliance, which is nondiscrimination in our programs and services. The MPO is going to be in a similar position, trying to outreach with our local partners to make sure that the City, the County, Ellettsville, Bloomington Transit, all have acceptable Title VI compliance plans and if they are not in compliance that they make every effort to comply and they have a plan to accomplish that. Just like ADA compliance plans, compliance with Title VI is a prerequisite for utilizing federal funds. It's very important that everyone meets those federal requirements so we can continue to keep that money coming in for those projects. That will be a point of emphasis in the next year as we work to make sure that each of our jurisdictions is covered by a Title VI plan that meets federal muster. I'm not going to cover the other three because hopefully you're familiar with them from our past work programs. Please read through this stuff just to become familiar with it so when we bring forward our work program you'll know what to look for in terms of how we're meeting those criteria.

Martin said I have a question about the last item, HSIP funds can be programmed for planning purposes for activities like road safety audits and safety data collection and analysis. Is that going to impact or offer any new opportunities for us to do data collection and analysis?

Desmond said we can program up to 15% of our HSIP into our work program and use it for safety related planning activities. So we could fund an RSA through the work program with some HSIP money if we had a location we wanted to assist an LPA. We could also fund staff time to do data clean up with our crash data. There are some opportunities for us to explore there. The flip side is we're taking 15% of that money away from construction projects, so it's a balance.

Martin said it would allow us to use a little more of our program money for other things other than those analyses. We now have another source of funding for those.

- c. Administrative Amendment to the TIP: Anna Dragovich presented. You all got an email earlier about some administrative amendments for Bloomington Transit. This is fast track way to get amendments approved because these are very small amendments. In these cases mostly just the funding source was being changed. This is a way for the MPO director and Policy Committee chair to approve those with your option to object. With this case there were no objections, so the administrative amendments were approved into the TIP. We'll be reporting it to the TAC and the CAC as well.

VI. Old Business

- a. Federal Functional Classification*: Desmond presented. This should be familiar with many with you. This is the third time we've brought proposed changes to the Federal Functional Classes in Monroe County to this body. If you recall, we've had a mandate from INDOT and FHWA to go through not only Federal Functional Classification, but also National Truck

Network and National Highway System changes in our county. Last month this body adopted recommendations on NHS and the truck network. Those have since been forwarded on to INDOT to package with all the other areas in Indiana and submit for sign off on the USDOT level. We're hoping to do the same thing with functional class today so we can move forward with those changes. As I said, this has been before you a couple times before. On both other occasions, there were some questions raised we wanted to have adequate answers to so we knew the proposal we made had everyone's agreement. We've gone back to drawing board a couple of times to work that out. Since this was before you last September we did convene a significant meeting among committee members from all three of our committees as well as representatives from INDOT and FHWA and we had a really good discussion about what the impacts of all these different mapping changes are, what they mean, what they don't mean, and hopefully got everybody comfortable with what we were working on. That meeting was highly instrumental in us moving forward with the NHS and national truck revisions we did last month and fostered several more meetings on a local level between the City and County and MPO staff to try to step through the process and get everybody comfortable with a proposed set of changes to the Federal Functional Classifications. I think I can say everyone is comfortable with the set of changes you have in front of you today. We're hoping we can get to a resolution on this today.

I'm going to really quickly walk you through what the new proposal looks like. There's a long list of changes. To refresh your memory a little bit, there are seven categories of roads. The key factors that are under consideration in dedicating the roadways is mobility versus access. Because this is a federal classification system, so we need to break away from the local level and look at large scale connectivity. Interstate speaks for itself in terms of mobility. It's very high mobility and no access. As you work your way down the scale you reach local roads which are all about adjacent property access and not going to be high speed thoroughfares that grant you a lot of mobility between distant points. At a certain point there's a tipping point on the scale where it becomes a more local access type of road and less a regional or national mobility type of roadway. One of the questions that was outstanding that took a little bit for us to come to grips with was to understand what classifications are federally eligible, which is a key for us in terms of how we spend the money we get from the federal level. If you look at classifications 1-5- interstate, other freeways, other principal arterials, minor arterials and major collector- those are all federal aid eligible roadways, specifically as it pertains to STP funding which is our largest source of funding. That is true both within our urbanized areas and outside of it. Minor collector there is one minor quirk where it is eligible within an urban area, so within the MPO's Urbanized Area boundary, if a road is designated a minor collector it is STP eligible. If it's outside that urbanized area boundary, it is not. Local roads are not. I will say there are a wide variety of exceptions and caveats to that for different funding programs and different project types. This is a general federal aid eligible list, but there are still lots of ways you can find federal funding for certain types of roads and certain types of projects. It doesn't immediately rule out all federal funding.

I'm going to take this from the interstate down and go through it layer by layer to give you an idea how it was constructed. I69 is the only true interstate we've identified through Monroe County. Then we overlay other freeways, which is adding on SR 37 as it branches off from I69 down to the south part of the county. Other principal arterials is primarily additional state roads that have been added, SR 46 through the county, SR 48 from I69 out to Hartstraight Rd, and then SR 45 from I69 west to the county line. Again, not a large number of roads in those categories. In the next categories we start adding a more significant amount of roads. We start adding our minor arterials and you can start to see the network build through the city and some areas in the county. W. 3rd St, E 3rd St, College and Walnut, some of those major traffic routes through the city and out into the county. SR 48 going the rest of the way out into the county, Vernal Pike, Curry Pike. The roads that are major traffic carriers locally we consider

a minor arterial on the federal level. Then we add in the major collectors and you start to see some more in the city but there are significantly more roads identified as major collectors out in the county. Then finally we add minor collectors which complete the network and interconnect with our major collectors and start building towards the higher levels of the system. You can see there's a pretty significant number of roads that are classified. Anything that isn't colored on our map is a local designation which doesn't rise to the level of a federal aid classification. The federal guidance document we used to help define this process for us provides a rough target of what percentage of roadways should be in each of these categories. Comparing our existing and proposed classifications, most of them fall very close to the target range that was provided in the guidance document. I think we ended up in a good place and I think the changes that we made are sensible in terms of what they move. We're seeking approval today so we can send this to INDOT so they can send it to the federal level for final signoff with the Secretary of Transportation.

Martin said I have a question about the north 37 interstate. Part of it is hard to tell. I'm assuming the major collectors you have identified up there are the access roads next to it rather than the interstate itself and that the interstate is all classified as interstate all the way up?

McKim said that was going to be my question, too. I think those are the frontage roads.

Desmond said I think it's just a matter of the mapping system overlaying the layers. We built this map layering the lower level streets on top of major roads.

Martin said so the intent is to make those frontage roads major collectors?

Desmond said yes, they don't need to be classified as interstates.

****Ryterband** moved to approve the changes to the Federal Functional Classification System and pass it to INDOT. Martin seconded. Martin requested an update to the motion that the classification is for the final draft that is in packet so we make sure it is specific to this. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

VII. New Business

a. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

- (1) *Add Pedestrian Safety and Accessibility at Signalized Intersections**: Dragovich presented. This project is sponsored by the City of Bloomington. It is for pedestrian safety and accessibility improvements. What this project would do is install pedestrian signal heads with countdown timers and accessible pedestrian push buttons at city maintained traffic signals as well as improving curb ramps and installing and refreshing crosswalks at the various locations identified on the map that was included in your packet. This project is asking for HSIP funding for FY 2018. The city intends to use local funding only for design and right-of-way and HSIP funding for construction. The amount is \$507,150. Neil Kopper, the project engineer, can answer any questions.

Martin asked what percentage of the intersections with a need for these improvements is represented in this request. I know we can't do them all at one time. I'm assuming there are more. About how many more?

Neil Kopper said we made a list starting with all the City's signalized intersections and looked at which ones have pedestrian countdown times and buttons and which ones don't. From the list of the intersections that don't, we only ruled out intersections that already have an upcoming project or intersections in such bad condition they needed a larger project. These are intersections where we didn't want to just go in and put in

countdown timers because the intersection didn't have sidewalks on any of the legs and there was nothing connecting to it so we need to do a lot more to it. There were a dozen or more intersections that have been taken out of the list that do need the countdown timers but are intersections we don't think would be a good fit for this project.

McKim said this question is more for staff. This request will use up all of the FY '18 HSIP funding.

Desmond said that is correct.

McKim said the county also has a proposal for a safety project at Smith Pike. How does the fact that all the FY '18 funding goes to this project affect the county's proposal for the Smith Pike project?

Desmond we're working with the County to develop that proposal for FY '19, whether it's an HSIP project or an STP project we think either way we can find the money to put it in for FY '19.

****Ryterband moved approval of the TIP amendment. Ruff seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.**

VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*)

- a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas: None at this time.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – February 24, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – February 24, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- c. Policy Committee – March 11, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

**Action Requested / Public comment prior to vote (limited to five minutes per speaker)*

Minutes approved 3/11/16. EJEA